

# Utah Department of Air Quality

## PM2.5 SIP Workgroup Meeting Summary: Round 1

---

August-September 2011



Utah Department of Environmental Quality  
195 North 1950 West  
Salt Lake City, Utah  
801-536-4400



Contents

Purpose of Meetings..... 3

Handouts..... 4

Agenda ..... 4

Meeting Locations & Specifics ..... 5

    Meeting 1, Box Elder/Weber Counties ..... 5

    Meeting 2, Utah County..... 7

    Meeting 3, Tooele County..... 9

    Meeting 4, Cache County..... 10

    Meeting 5, Davis County ..... 12

    Meeting 6, Salt Lake County ..... 14

## Purpose of Meetings

Prior to convening Round 1 Workgroup meetings were held in six locations along the Wasatch Front. These meeting were primarily informational for the workgroup participants, providing baseline information and workgroup orientation. Workgroup members where invited from many local government, academic, commercial, and industrial interest to begin participation in the development of the State Implementation Plan. Locations included Box Elder/Weber, Utah, Tooele, Cache, Davis, and Salt Lake Counties. A summary of the Workgroup Meetings' designed purpose is identified in Table 1 below.

**Table 1: Workgroup Meeting Purposes**

	<b>Workgroup Meeting 1 Purposes</b>
<b>Participants</b>	DAQ and Workgroup
<b>Goal of Meetings</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issue and Process Introduction</li> <li>• Training for Participation Roles (constituent information and advocacy, control strategy consultation)</li> <li>• Discussion of strategy menus/feasibility factors</li> <li>• Assignments in preparation for Meeting 2</li> </ul>
<b>DAQ will Present</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introductions: Introduce DAQ, Consultant, and WG members</li> <li>• PI Process Overview: introduce the purpose of this and future meetings</li> <li>• Technical and Process Realities Overview. Explain critical pieces of process, realities and limitations in terms of the outcome of process, other information</li> <li>• Current Modeling and Inventories, PM filter composition</li> <li>• High-level pollution charts. Show how major changes in one area affect the big picture. Illustrate how complex the reduction effort will be, and how parties will be involved in solutions</li> <li>• Deliver and discuss strategy menus and feasibility factors (mobile/point/areas–pick examples illustrating relationship between strategies and feasibility issues)</li> <li>• Q&amp;A: Assess and discuss problems/questions that relate to the model or inventory data and presentation</li> <li>• WG Training on How to involve Constituents, Wrap-up and assignments</li> </ul>
<b>Participants Will</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learn about specific roles in terms of constituent information and advocacy and control strategy consultation</li> <li>• Participate in an Information Needs Assessment and help DAQ refine the way it is providing information to WG and the public</li> <li>• Participate in discussion of problems/questions about the modeling, inventories, presentation of information, and “custom” model runs that may add critical data</li> <li>• Learn about the strategy menus and feasibility factors that they will use to rank strategies in the forthcoming survey.</li> <li>• Learn how specifically to involve their constituency in the process of gathering and transmitting information to DAQ</li> <li>• Suggest modeling runs that may add important data for analysis</li> </ul>
<b>Promise to Participants (DAQ will):</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide a web update schedule</li> <li>• Provide Meeting Summaries</li> <li>• Update modeling runs as needed</li> <li>• Update control strategy lists and rank them using input from the forthcoming survey</li> </ul>

<b>Meeting Approach</b>	Workshop: DAQ leads and presents, Facilitator moderates and presents, WG interacts
<b>Post-Meeting Approach</b>	Information needs assessment and survey for control strategy feasibility sent to all WG members. Follow-ups to help maintain overall timeframes to be sent weekly.
<b>Timeline</b>	<b>August – September</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting 1: (Box Elder/Weber – 8/15, 1-4 pm)</li> <li>• Meeting 2: (Utah – 8/18, 9-Noon)</li> <li>• Meeting 3: (Tooele – 8/18, 2-5pm)</li> <li>• Meeting 4: (Cache – 8/29, 1-4pm)</li> <li>• Meeting 5: (Davis – 8/31, 1-4pm)</li> <li>• Meeting 6: (SL – 9/9, 9-Noon)</li> </ul>

## Handouts

Workbooks were provided for each Workgroup member in attendance and included five sections:

- Presentation Slides
- Information Resources
- Workgroup Contact Information
- Control Strategies
- Constituent Involvement and Assignments

## Agenda

Each meeting was grouped into three approximate single-hour blocks.

1. The first hour included:
  - a. Introductions by Dave McNeill
  - b. Overview of the Public Involvement Process by Stacey Adams
  - c. Technical and Process overview by Bill Reiss.
2. The second hour included:
  - a. Modeling Sensitivity Results by Tyler Cruickshank
  - b. Current Emission Inventories by Patrick Barickman
  - c. Both topics included Workgroup Q&A.
3. The third hour included:
  - a. Intro to RACT/RACM and Reduction Strategies by Bill Reis
  - b. Developing Emission Reduction Strategies-Issues to Consider by Glade Sowards
  - c. Training on how to Involve “Constituents” workgroup exercise by Buck Swaney
  - d. Wrap-up and Assignments by Stacey Adams and Buck Swaney.

## Meeting Locations & Specifics

**Meeting 1, Box Elder/Weber Counties, Bear River Health Dept, 817 West 950 South, Brigham City. August 15, 2011, 1:00 – 4:00 pm**

Attendees: 15 Workgroup members were invited, 8 DAQ representatives, and 1 Consultant Facilitator

### Key Observations from Meeting:

1. High turnout of Workgroup members with engaged discussion. A natural focus emerged in relation to agricultural considerations and VOC concerns.
2. Group discussion took place on several definitions. The group required technical clarification of basic terms including VOC, NOX, PM2.5, Primary, Secondary, Source Categories, Model, and Inventory. Because of this, the need to ensure basic education around PM2.5 dynamics was identified.
3. One WG member voiced concerns about the monitoring station located behind the McDonalds and that this location was artificially inflating the data to above allowable quantities. In relation to this concern, some WG members wanted to know if there would be more monitoring stations added to the county.
4. WG members were concerned with the area source data specifically related to the livestock inventories and locations. Also concerned to know whether this accounted for seasonal cattle shipping to other areas.
5. WG members questioned to attainment timeframe and if there was opportunity to extend the window.
6. Can there be a Technical Support document available to WG member on the DAQ website.
7. Several WG members questioned the legitimacy of the information and/or data. These participants asked questions such as “Why is Box Elder included and isn’t our County’s

PM2.5 pollution really coming from SLC?” also “Why don’t we have more monitoring stations?”

8. WG members asked why there were no slides discussing health effects.
9. WG members asked how strategies will be implemented. Will strategies for Box Elder be the same as for Salt Lake?
10. WG members felt info was hard to access unless you knew exactly where to look.

Commitments from DAQ:

1. WG members requested that the DAQ provide the technical support document to ensure an adequate understanding of how emission data was used. DAQ committed to this.
2. DAQ committed to providing several information updates and a survey in coming weeks to help capture constituent inputs.
3. DAQ committed to provide an orientation email listing the resources available to understanding PM2.5 issues.
4. DAQ committed to providing several information updates and a survey in coming weeks to help capture constituent inputs.

**Meeting 2, Utah County, Utah County Health Dept, 151 S University Ave, Provo. August 18, 2011, 9:00 am – 12:00 pm**

Attendees: 16 Workgroup members were invited, 8 DAQ representatives, and 1 Consultant Facilitator

Key Observations from Meetings:

1. High turnout of Workgroup members with engaged discussion. A natural focus emerged in relation to terminology and definitions, as well as technical process items.
2. WG contained more political members than other WGs.
3. WG members spent some time discussing the relationship between Federal and State entities and their relative roles in the SIP process.
4. Numerous WG member requested definition of terms including SIP, Control Strategy, SO<sub>2</sub>, and other similar technical terms. DAQ identified the need to “sound out” all of these in subsequent meetings.
5. A long discussion was managed around the term “Control Strategy” with many WG participants feeling that it was politically contentious to use this term. DAQ subsequently changed terminology in slideshows and presentations to “Emission Management Strategies”.
6. WG members identified the fact that DAQ’s presentation, although identifying health as a key focus of the process, contained no health effect discussion. This theme was identified in other WG meetings as well. Participants want UDAQ to specifically spell out the health risks and effects of PM<sub>2.5</sub>.
7. WG members also asked about the locations of monitoring stations in Utah County, and whether there are enough stations to accurately depict PM<sub>2.5</sub> levels and issues within the Valley.
8. WG member discussed how area source PM<sub>2.5</sub> from residential heating was a large contributor to elevated readings. One WG member referred to State initiative to install



energy efficient heating systems in residential units and the low success rate of the program. WG noted that there could be large gains to be made in this aspect of area source pollution.

Commitments from DAQ:

1. WG asked for a more complete list of “Reduction Pathway” definitions for area/mobile/point sources. DAQ agreed to provide these.
2. DAQ committed to providing several information updates and a survey in coming weeks to help capture constituent inputs.

**Meeting 3, Tooele County, Tooele County Health Dept, 151 N Main Street, Tooele. August 18, 2011, 2:00 – 5:00 pm**

Attendees: 8 Workgroup members were invited, 9 DAQ representatives, and 1 Consultant Facilitator

Key Observations from Meetings:

1. Low turnout of Workgroup members, only 3 of 8 invitees attended. No key, natural focus emerged in the meeting. Relatively few substantive questions emerged from the WG.
2. Key question was raised around defining who the WG member's constituents are.
3. WG generated inadequate representation from local government and industry in the Tooele Valley.

Commitments from DAQ:

1. DAQ agreed internally to improve the membership of this WG prior to Round 2 meeting of the process.
2. DAQ committed to providing several information updates and a survey in coming weeks to help capture constituent inputs.

**Meeting 4, Cache County, Bear River Health Dept, 655 East 1300 North, Logan. August 29, 2011, 1:00 – 4:00 pm**

Attendees: 19 Workgroup members were invited, 9 DAQ representatives, and 1 Consultant Facilitator

Key Observations from Meetings:

1. High turnout of Workgroup members and technically astute WG. Natural focus on agriculture and culturally important uses to the valley emerged.
2. WG members wanted to know if there would be more monitoring stations added to the county.
3. WG members were concerned with the area source data specifically related to the livestock inventories and locations.
4. WG members asked how strategies will be implemented. Will strategies for Cache County be the same as for Salt Lake or will the County end up with its own County-specific strategies.
5. Discussion on Utah State University and what measures they have already gone through to mitigate their role of PM<sub>2.5</sub> contributions.
6. WG discussed working with Franklin Idaho in developing a valley-wide SIP. Franklin representative informed the WG that they would be developing their own SIP and are not a large contributor to PM<sub>2.5</sub> in the Valley.
7. WG discussed the extent of existing emission retrofits on public vehicles including busses and fleets.
8. DAQ presented slides illustrating the removal of all Point/Mobile/Area Sources, which seemed to conclude that point sources were not a critical target for the strategies. The WG was instructed (in spite of this) that all source categories should be reviewed for Emission Management Strategies.

9. Some WG members questioned the scale of how Point Sources were measured and if there were any Point Sources that may be major contributors but fell below the cut-off in the dataset and then were not represented adequately in the presentations (e.g., Pepperidge Farms).

Commitments from DAQ:

1. DAQ committed to providing several information updates and a survey in coming weeks to help capture constituent inputs.
2. DAQ was to provide inventory document of all Point/Mobile/Area Sources and data.
3. DAQ was to provide electronic copies of all materials and workbooks.

**Meeting 5, Davis County, Davis County Health Dept, 22 State Street, Clearfield. August 31, 2011, 1:00 – 4:00 pm**

Attendees: 16 Workgroup members were invited, 9 DAQ representatives, and 1 Consultant Facilitator

Key Observations from Meetings:

1. High turnout of Workgroup members and technically astute WG. Natural focus emerged on industry contributions (refineries and print industries specifically).
2. WG contained more political members than many other WGs.
3. WG members questioned if Davis County was truly out of compliance or is Salt Lake County pollution overflowing and causing elevated PM2.5 counts in Davis County.
4. WG members asked if Davis County strategies will be specific to their issues.
5. Some WG members questioned the scale of how Point Sources were measured and if there were any Point Sources that may be major contributors were not represented as major contributors to PM2.5.
6. WG expressed concern over the definition of Area Source and wanted to know if there was a way to separate various commercial uses from residential use to accurately depict how much was caused by each.
7. WG members wanted to see more information on health as a key focus of the process.
8. WG members representing the printing industry felt that data showing how much solvent they use during the printing process was out-of-date and did not accurately reflect current printing techniques and conservation efforts.
9. In presentation slides, WG member questioned the bar graphs representing the totals from Point/Mobile/Area Sources and an apparent discrepancy between two slides.

Commitments from DAQ:

1. DAQ was to provide inventory document of all mobile/point/area sources and data

2. DAQ committed to providing several information updates and a survey in coming weeks to help capture constituent inputs.
3. DAQ committed to addressing discrepancies in data across different slides.

**Meeting 6, Salt Lake County, UDEQ Complex, 195 North 1950 West, Salt Lake City. September 9, 2011, 9:00 am – 12:00 pm**

Attendees: 25 Workgroup members were invited, 3 EPA Representatives, 10 DAQ representatives, and 1 Consultant Facilitator

Key Observations from Meetings:

1. High turnout of Workgroup members and most technically astute WG. Natural focus on the technical nature of data presented emerged.
2. Expectations to move beyond the basic material were high.
3. Dialogue between WG and DAQ made it difficult to maintain timing with so many participants.
4. Many participants were particularly concerned by the relationship between NOX and VOC and how a decrease in NOX may actually increase PM2.5, independent of what happens with VOCs. Several of these WG participants felt like they needed much more or better information before they could proceed developing the right kind of Emission Management Strategies. The need to provide VOC-Centered strategies to help them focus the WG efforts was identified as a major theme of questions.
5. Several of the WG members were concerned with the efficiency of the process and did not want to duplicate efforts.
6. One key suggestion was to create an area within the DAQ website (something like FAQs) where technical matter and questions can be asked and then publically answered. This would help capture the content from “hallway” discussion and make it useful and accessible to everyone.
7. Several Participants were emphatic that strategies of long term importance not be ignored simply because there is an attainment deadline. Specifically, questions were asked and ideas vetted in relation to making a separate “column” for air quality

improvement strategies that may not help within the attainment window but would achieve important longer term improvements.

8. WG members were specifically concerned that the timeframe for development of SIP strategies is too short, given work schedules and logistical challenges of working with their constituencies.

Commitments from DAQ:

1. One WG participant requested the opportunity to review and add content to the exercise worksheet, DAQ agreed to consider changes for additional analysis columns in the next week or so.
2. DAQ committed to providing several information updates and a survey in coming weeks to help capture constituent inputs.